



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/828,431

04/20/2004

Vijay R. Basani

20496/5 CON

5483

21710

7590

11/29/2006

BROWN, RUDNICK, BERLACK & ISRAELS, LLP.
BOX 1P, 18TH FLOOR
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

LUU, LE HIEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/828,431	Applicant(s) BASANI ET AL.	
	Examiner Le H. Luu	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04/20/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/20/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 1, 5, and 12 are presented for examination.
2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1 and 5, drawn to using network nodes to distribute information, classified in class 709, subclass 238.
 - II. Claims 12, drawn to determining completion status of processing of network node, classified in class 709, subclass 237.
3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I, and Group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention Group I has separate utility such as using network nodes to distribute information, Group II has separate utility such as determining completion status of processing of network node. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
4. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
 - a. These inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification.
 - b. The search required for one Group is not required for the other Groups

For the reasons above restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 2141

5. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Brian L. Michaelis on 11/21/06, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1 and 5. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in responding to this Office action. Claim 12 is withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

or

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by **Hailpern et al. (Hailpern)** patent no. **6,065,058**.

8. As to claim 5, Hailpern teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of distributing information to a set of servers connected via a communication network comprising the steps of:

obtaining a list of servers desiring to participate in a distribution (col. 5 lines 35-44);

prioritizing said list according to parameters associated with each servers (col. 5 lines 52-57; col. 7 lines 26-36);

issuing instructions to each server in the listed order, said instructions including the identification of a source for obtaining said information and an identification of the next server on the list (col. 7 lines 36-60; col. 9 lines 1-21);

distributing said information according to said instructions (col. 9 lines 22-40);
and

notifying each server when the prioritized list is exhausted (col. 7 lines 48-60) in which said steps of issuing instructions and distributing said information further comprise the steps of:

(A) obtaining an address of a first server address on said list (col. 5 lines 8-27; col. 5 lines 52-57);

(B) sending a notification message containing the address of a second server

having an information file to distribute (col. 5 lines 8-27; col. 5 lines 52-57);

(C) requesting a copy of said information from said second server; whereby said copy of said information is sent to each server on said list in an order determined according to the order of the list and the transmission time in the network (col. 5 lines 8-27; col. 5 lines 45-57).

9. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,447. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed invention has similar limitations as the cited claims of the U.S. patent.

10. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985) *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

11. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double

patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

12. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Le H. Luu whose telephone number is 571-272-3884. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Le Hien Luu', is written over a horizontal line.

LE HIEN LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER